

**Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2100
Draft Summary of the Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
January 18, 2005**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on January 18, 2005 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Prehistoric Site Evaluation Summary

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – December 7, 2004 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the December 2004 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of the action item from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C72: Review Preliminary Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP).
Status: Participants were asked to review the draft document and provide comments at this January 18, 2005 CRWG meeting. The Facilitator noted that HPMP development is a separate agenda item for this meeting. (See summary of discussion below).

Update on Studies

Ethnographic Evaluations

Helen McCarthy, Far Western Anthropological Research Group (FW) told the CRWG that FW is finalizing the ethnographic interviews. The final interview was scheduled to take place within a week. She informed the CRWG that once the interviews are complete they would focus on evaluations, continued collaboration with the archaeological team, and documentation.

Prehistoric Archaeological Evaluations

Michael Delacorte of California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) reported that the prehistoric team had been conducting test excavations at sites on McCabe Creek. He distributed a summary of the prehistoric site evaluations (Attachment 3). They were originally planning to look at seven site loci in the area; however, two of the planned sites are currently under water. On the other hand, the team unexpectedly located two

similar type sites in the immediate vicinity to test in lieu of the inaccessible loci. He described how the fieldwork followed a set program that included walking over the area using a grid pattern, marking identified artifacts, mapping artifact locations, and then excavating 1 meter by ½ meter units at selected locations. He described McCabe Creek as an area that is flooded on an annual basis. As the result, there is evidence that sediment has been washed away at some locations due to geography and wave action from the reservoir, while soil has been re-deposited in other places. In general, bone preservation is poor, with few fragments collected. Worked obsidian has been found, including some diagnostic pieces such as projectile points. He added that there is also evidence of continued illegal collecting at some of the sites.

Michael provided some details about the sub-surface soil stratigraphy revealed by the excavation units at the McCabe Creek sites. He explained that the depth of deposits varied widely due in part to localized conditions. One participant asked if it would be worthwhile to do a comparison of site versus non-site soils to better understand erosion effects within the study areas. Michael described their observations and agreed it would be interesting to compare soil deposits within and outside of the fluctuation zone. He added that they plan to install rebar at selected locations at McCabe Creek to monitor sediment activity. Eric Ritter (Bureau of Land Management) mentioned that photographs of site locations taken in the 1960s might be useful for possible disturbance/erosion comparisons. Michael Delacorte indicated a report detailing the McCabe Creek excavations would be completed in June 2005.

Historic-Era Archaeological Evaluations

Mark Selverston of Sonoma State University (SSU) presented a slide show that provided additional information on the historic team's efforts, building on information delivered to the CRWG in December. He described the variety of sites evaluated, including several mining sites such as the Southern Cross Quartz Mine, McCabe, bench placer locations near Enterprise, and Powell Creek. He noted that these sites represent both large-scale hydraulic mining and small-scale placer mining operations. The settlement sites evaluated included several homesteads with identified owners such as the Nash Homestead, Fischer Homestead, and Goat Ranch. Evaluated transportation sites included wagon roads, railroad grades, and construction roads. Water system sites that have been evaluated include the Hendricks Ditch, Old Flea Valley Ditch, and the New Flea Valley Ditch. Mark explained that while metal detectors were used selectively along old roads and trails, the majority of artifacts were found through survey and mapping efforts.

Mark informed the CRWG that historic field investigations are concluding and the only remaining site planned for evaluation at this time is the mouth of the Big Bend Tunnel and work camp, located upstream on the North Fork Feather River arm of Oroville Reservoir.

Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) Development

Janis Offermann (DWR) reminded the group that the action item from the last CRWG meeting was to review the Preliminary Draft Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) distributed at the meeting and by mail and to provide comments at this meeting. She told the CRWG that DWR would be meeting with some of the agencies

and the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC) for comments on the document (see Attachment 6 to the Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Meeting, December 7, 2004). She also reminded the CRWG that the document is in draft form and that DWR will not submit the HPMP to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) until mid-2005, in order to provide additional detail and more complete treatment plans. She identified February 15 as the target date for the CRWG to submit detailed comments to DWR and urged the CRWG to provide their comments in writing to her by that date. Janis added that a comment letter had been received from Leslie Steidl who thanked all the participants for their hard work and included Leslie's specific comments to the draft HPMP.

One participant expressed their interest in the potential for additional analysis and perhaps re-analysis of some locations to update existing reports. More extensive analysis such as DNA testing, faunal testing, and buried site potential were briefly discussed. The CRWG participants agreed to provide their comments to DWR by February 15.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

Janis Offermann suggested that the CRWG should meet again on May 17, 2005 to review progress on the HPMP. The CRWG agreed to meet on that date in Oroville (exact location to be confirmed) from 6:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.